

THE
EASTERN
CHURCHES
QUARTERLY

Editor : DOM BEDE WINSLOW

Associate Editor: DONALD ATTWATER

CONTENTS

THE ENCYCLICAL OF POPE PIUS XII :						<i>page</i>
<i>Orientalis Ecclesiae</i>	-	-	-		<i>The Editor</i>	1
THE LITURGY AND CHRISTIAN UNITY					<i>The Rev. J. D. Crichton</i>	9
THE STUDY OF CHURCH HISTORY AND CHRISTIAN REUNION					<i>Rev. Professor F. Dvornik, D.D.</i>	17
NEWS AND COMMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	37
LETTER TO THE EDITOR		-	-	-	-	46
RECENT PUBLICATIONS		-	-	-	-	47

SINGLE COPIES 2/- YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION 8/- POST FREE
U.S.A. AND CANADA 2 dollars

London Agents: Geo. E. J. Coldwell, Ltd., 17 Red Lion Square, Holborn, London, W.C.1, to whom all subscriptions are to be paid, except those from U.S.A.

U.S.A. Agent: The Secretary, Catholic Near East Welfare Association, 480 Lexington Avenue, New York 17, N.Y.

Literary Communications, Exchanges, and Books for Review
should be addressed to the Editor E.C.Q., St. Augustine's
Abbey, Ramsgate.

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

(Continuation of *Eastern Churches* Number of "Pax,"
founded 1931.)

VOL. VI

JANUARY-MARCH, 1945

No. I

THE ENCYCLICAL OF POPE PIUS XII, *ORIENTALIS ECCLESIAE*¹

THE encyclical is on St. Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, in celebration of the fifteenth centenary of his death. The main facts of the saint's life are recounted and especially his work for unity is stressed. The triple bond of unity established by Jesus Christ to bind the Church together is enlarged upon and is shown to be exemplified by St. Cyril, viz., as defender of the Faith, as promoter of Charity and as champion of the Holy See. The remaining part of the letter is an exhortation to unity and three personal appeals are made by the Pope—to the Orthodox, to the Monophysites and to the Nestorians. This letter then demands special and detailed consideration by all who are praying and working for the reunion of East and West, for Pius XII does in a very clear way make his own all the teaching of recent popes concerning "the proper respect for those traditions which are the special heritage of the peoples of the East, whether these be concerned with the sacred liturgy and the hierarchical Orders or with other observances of the Christian life, so long as they are in keeping with the true faith and with the moral law. Each and every nation of Oriental rite must have its rightful freedom in all that is bound up with its own history and its own genius and character, saving always the truth and integrity of the doctrine of Jesus Christ. We would have this to be known and appreciated by all, both by those who were born within the bosom of the Catholic Church, and by those who are wafted towards her, as it were, on the wings of yearning and desire. The

¹ Translated by Canon G. D. Smith and published by the C.T.S. under the title *Rome and the Eastern Churches*. The Latin text had been published in the *Osservatore Romano*, April 23rd, 1944.

latter especially should have full assurance that they will never be forced to abandon their own legitimate rites or to exchange their own venerable and traditional customs for Latin rites and customs. All these are to be held in equal esteem and equal honour, for they adorn the common Mother Church with a royal garment of many colours. Indeed this variety of rites and customs, preserving inviolate what is most ancient and most valuable in each, presents no obstacle to a true and genuine unity. It is especially in these times of ours, when the strife and discord of war has estranged men's hearts from one another nearly all the world over, that all must be impelled by the stimulus of Christian charity to promote union in Christ and through Christ by every means in their power" (pp. 14, 15).

This we think is the clearest and most detailed reference to what may in general terms be called the Eastern Tradition, of any Pope. He by no means confines his statements concerning the Eastern rites only to the sacred liturgies or the valid sacraments of the Dissidents, but explicitly mentions *other observances of the Christian life*, saying also that *every nation of the Oriental rite must have its rightful freedom in all that is bound up with its own history and its own genius and character*. This express distinction between *customs* and *rites* by the Pope confirms what many workers in the field of Christian reunion in the East have maintained when claiming that Catholic truth and practice needs to be expressed (at least) by two mentalities.¹ This has a far reaching bearing on any future reconciliation of the dissident Eastern Churches with the See of Rome.

But let us consider more fully what the Pope calls "the triple bond which Christ Jesus, the Founder of the Church, willed to be the supernatural and unbreakable link provided by Him for binding and holding it together" (p. 8). This triple bond of Faith, Charity and Loyalty to the Holy See, the Pope says, is set forth and exemplified by St. Cyril.

First, then, the Faith. Let St. Cyril of Alexandria, the Pope says, be our model in the energy and fortitude with which he defended the Faith and kept it inviolate (p. 11). He then quotes from the saint:—

¹ The thesis of the *Eastern and Western Mentality* as two authentic expressions of Catholicism was enlarged upon by the Metropolitan Szepieticky. A translation of this appeared in the *Eastern Churches Number of Pax*, January and April issues, 1933. Also see Appendix.

"We (writes St. Cyril) to whom the truth and the doctrines of truth are most dear, refuse to follow these heretics ; we, taking the faith of the holy Fathers as our guide, will guard against all errors the divine revelation committed to our trust."

"For the faith that is in Christ (he says again) it is my greatest wish to toil, to live, and to die. Only let the faith be kept safe and untarnished . . . and no insults, no injuries, no reproaches can move me " (p. 9).

Even on the plea of promoting unity it is not allowed to dissemble one single dogma. As St. Cyril writes, "although the desire of peace is a noble and excellent thing, yet we must not for its sake neglect the virtue of loyalty in Christ " (pp. 10-11). But faith, the Pope says, must be accompanied by charity, charity which unites us all with one another and with Christ ; charity which under the inspiration and motion of the Divine Spirit, welds the members of the Mystical Body of the Redeemer together by an unbreakable bond (p. 12).

St. Cyril, even when dealing with Nestorius, wrote :—

"Only let the things that concern the faith be saved, and I am a friend and beloved and yield to no one in showing greater love for the most God-beloved Bishop Nestorius, etc."¹

At the conclusion of the reconciliation of the bishops of the Province of Antioch, he (Cyril) wrote : "Let the heavens rejoice, and let the earth be glad. For the middle wall of partition has been broken down ; that which had caused us grief is now at peace ; every matter of contention has now been removed ; Christ the Saviour of us all has granted peace to His Churches " (p. 14). Applying this to the present day the Pope says : "More effective than anything else for promoting that reunion of all our separated sons with the one Church of Christ for which all good men are striving, will be a sincere and practical goodwill, with the help and inspiration of God. The fruit of such goodwill is mutual understanding"—for this, he says, was the Oriental Institute established in Rome (p. 14).

In this letter the Pope does not deal with the Council of Ephesus and the primacy of the Roman Pontiff (this had been already dealt with by Pope Pius XI in *Lux veritatis*), but he does (as we have said above) speak of St. Cyril as a champion

¹ Referred to by the Pope (p. 12), but quoted in full by the late Archbishop of Athens in his book, *The Third Œcumenical Council*, etc., p. 16.

of the Holy See. His treatment of the position of the Holy See in this letter should be noted, although quite outspoken in basing its claims on *the supreme authority of Peter and his successors*, yet in calling it the third of the triple bond which binds the Church together, he calls it the *bond* "of one obedience and rightful submission *to the hierarchy* established by the Divine Redeemer himself" (p. 8).

The selected quotations from St. Cyril are also interesting. The saint, reporting on the errors of Nestorius to Pope St. Celestine, writes :—

"Since God requires us to be vigilant in these matters, and since the ancient custom of the Church persuades us that questions of this kind should be communicated to your holiness, I write, driven by necessity" (p. 16).

After the Council of Ephesus, Cyril writes :—

"To my orthodox faith the Church of Rome has borne witness, and so too has a holy Synod gathered together, so to speak, from the whole of the earth that is under heaven" (p. 17).

Lastly, Pope St. Xystus III writes to St. Cyril after peace had been restored :—

"Behold while We were suffering great anxiety—for We would have none to perish—your holiness' letter brought Us news that the Body of the Church has been made whole again. Now that the structure of its members has been fitted together again, We see none outside or gone astray, for their one faith testifies that all are at their places within. . . The whole brotherhood has now come to agreement with the blessed Apostle Peter ; behold here an auditorium befitting the hearers, befitting the things heard therein. . . Our brethren are come back to us whose common aim had been to attack the disease that we might bring health to souls. . . Rejoice in triumph over the return of our brethren to us. The Church had been seeking those whom she has now received back again. If we would not have any even of the little ones to perish, how much more must we rejoice now that their rulers are safe" (p. 19).

This presentation of the position of the See of Rome, setting it in the midst of the Church,¹ so to say, should, we think,

* 1 All this must be taken in conjunction with the encyclical on the Mystical Body of Christ.

encourage the Eastern Churches to be ready to approach us in the spirit of mutual understanding and free discussion in all charity. Such indeed seems to be the opinion of the Coptic priest, Father Sergius (of Kolaly), a friend of the patriarch, and even to some extent that of Christophoros, Orthodox Patriarch of Alexandria, for though questioning the claims of the papal position, he concedes the *possibility* of a Council where the Roman and Eastern Churches might meet to discuss matters of dogma. And report hath it¹ that the *encyclical* has been received with sympathy in some Orthodox circles in Greece, Serbia and Rumania.

In his conclusion (Exhortation) the Pope first turns to his own faithful children and urges specially those Catholics living in the East to promote the causes of unity by friendly intercourse with the Orthodox and other Eastern Christians, and above all with their clergy; that in the seminaries and other colleges the custom of the *Eastern Day*, i.e., a day devoted to prayer for and the study of the Christian East, should be taken up, and that, in fine, all those taking part in *Catholic Action* should in every way foster the desire of reunion with the East. To the Orthodox and other Eastern Churches the Pope asked that his appeal may be given a friendly hearing by their bishops and urges that an unprejudiced and careful study of St. Cyril's writings² will be a powerful means in restoring peace and the triple bond of unity of which he has spoken.

This recent letter of the Holy Father then opens up points for discussion and expansion; it gives particular emphasis to our work, giving us indeed, a programme and a patron—a programme based on an uncompromising loyalty to the Catholic Faith (so specially needed in work for Christian unity), and hence a loyalty to the Holy See as the God-given guardian

¹ Vide, *The Tablet*, November 18th, 1944, pp. 244, 245.

² The Works of St. Cyril of Alexandria. J. Aubert, a canon of Paris, published the complete text of Cyril of Alexandria in Greek in six folio volumes (Paris 1638). This is the only complete edition. It is reprinted with a Latin translation in Migne, P.Gr. LXVIII—LXXVII. R. P. Smith translated *A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*, by St. Cyril (Oxford 1859, 2 vols.), and W. Wright, *Fragments of the Homilies of Cyril on St. Luke* (London 1874). There is an English translation (anonymous) of Cyril's *Commentary on St. John* (London 1880–1886). *Three Epistles*. English translation (Oxford 1872); Translation in the Oxford "Library of the Fathers"; *Five tomes Against Nestorius* (1881). For further bibliography see Adrian Fortescu's *St. Cyril of Alexandria* in *The Greek Fathers* (C.T.S. 1908). *Catholic Encyclopaedia*, Vol. IV, etc.

of this Faith. But along with this should go great Charity and the power of understanding the other side. This goodwill and understanding implies a proper respect for those traditions which are the special heritage of the peoples of the East. Here then is the great need of making these desires of the Popes known and brought before the ordinary intellectual Catholic and others by means of articles on theological and kindred subjects dealing with the Christian traditions of East and West. In stressing the importance of this work, the encyclical is but emphasising previous papal directions from Leo XIII to the present time and especially the work of Pius XI. Here indeed the Pope blesses and indicates the line to be taken by the *Eastern Churches Quarterly*. And giving us a patron. The Pope has set St. Cyril before us as one who both by word and deed is an example of bringing about true harmony, and he would have us imitate this saint to-day. We have quoted in this paper St. Cyril's own words showing him as a champion of the Faith.¹ But it may surprise many to know that in the last years of his life it was St. Cyril who stopped an agitation among Catholics to have Theodore of Mopsuestia condemned. It should also be remembered that the Orthodox consider him as the "Seal of the Fathers." Hence it is fitting to end this survey by giving the three qualities that the Pope says distinguish the Fathers of the East and especially St. Cyril: an outstanding sanctity of life, marked by a special ardent devotion to the august Mother of God; exceptional learning and finally an energetic zeal in fearlessly repelling the attacks of heretics, in asserting the Catholic faith and in defending and spreading the Gospel to the full extent of his power (p. 7).

We end by quoting the Greek *Menaia* in honour of St. Cyril (on June 9th):—

"Enlightened in mind by the flames of the Holy Spirit, thou hast uttered oracles even as the sun sends forth its rays. To the ends of the earth and to all the faithful thy teaching has gone forth, O most blessed saint, illuminating all sorts and conditions of men and dispelling the darkness of heresy by the power and strength of that Light who was born of the Virgin" (p. 7).

THE EDITOR.

¹ Dr. G. L. Prestige, though not white-washing Cyril, holds him as a great Doctor of the Church (in *Fathers and Heretics*, S.P.C.K. 1940) and Dr. S. H. Scott showed his importance in *Anglo-Catholicism and Reunion*, 1923.

APPENDIX.

We here give some special attention to the phrase *rites and customs* which the Holy Father uses in this encyclical to denote not only the liturgies but also other observances of the Christian life which characterise the Eastern Churches. In fact the word *customs*, as distinct from *rites*, would seem to indicate all that is bound up with the history, genius and character both ecclesiastical and national of the various Eastern Churches. Furthermore this explanation is placed in the section dealing with the mutual understanding which Catholics should show to the separated Eastern Churches. And Pius XII explicitly states that it was to foster and increase this understanding that his predecessors founded in Rome the Pontifical Institute of higher Oriental Studies. From this we can rightly infer that by *customs* is meant the whole Eastern Christian Tradition both in general and in particular "saving always," as the pope says, "the truth and integrity of the doctrine of Jesus Christ . . . and in keeping with the true faith and with the moral law." (pp. 14, 15).

We will, on account of space, confine our investigation to expounding the mind of the two popes who were founders of the Oriental Institute, viz., Benedict XV and Pius XI.

Benedict XV founded the institute for a post-graduate course. Here priests of the Latin rites as well as those of Oriental rites, both Catholic and Orthodox (*tum unitatis tum Orthodoxis qui appellantur*) are to study for three years Oriental questions; which studies are enumerated as follows:—

1. Theologia Orthodoxa quæ varias orientalium Christianorum de divinis rebus doctrinas attingat, cum prælectionibus de patrologia orientali de theologia historica ac de patristica.

2. Jus canonicum omnium orientis christianorum gentium.

3. Multiplex orientalium liturgia.

4. Byzantii orientisque reliqui historia tum sacra tum civilis, etc. (vid., A.A.S., Vol. IX, p. 532).

This is again confirmed by Pius XI: "In the courses of studies, besides the doctrinal theology of the separated Churches, oriental patrology, the explanation of method in oriental studies, history, liturgy, archæology and the languages of the Eastern nations." (*Rerum Orientalium*, English translation, p. 14).

This is specialist work which the popes hope to be established also in other universities and centres of studies, so that the West may understand the East. But it was meant to be translated (and already has been) into the realm of thought of the ordinary well-instructed Catholic by means of "Eastern Days" held in seminaries, schools and even parishes so that, as Pius XII would wish, it is made one of the ends of Catholic Action. All this, then, is to stimulate Catholics to prepare, by prayer and study, for the day of reunion with the separated Eastern Churches. Would that the preparation could be done together on a large scale! This, however, will only be possible if we bear in mind the above distinction between *rites* and *customs* which Pius XII has again stressed.

We do not say here that it is a new idea that an Oriental rite stands for much more than mere ritual but for a whole cultural tradition. This has been stressed by every pope since Leo XIII. It takes, however, a long time to sink in, and so needs constant reiteration.

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY CONFERENCE

This Conference was held at Blackfriars, Oxford (by kind permission of the Very Rev. Father Prior), from December 8th to 10th, 1944.

Friday, December 8th.

8 p.m. THE LITURGY AND CHRISTIAN UNITY.

Speaker: The Rev. J. D. Crichton.

Chairman: The Rev. M. Bevenot, S.J.

Saturday, December 9th.

2.30 p.m. THE STUDY OF CHURCH HISTORY AND CHRISTIAN
REUNION.

Speaker: The Rev. Professor F. Dvornik, D.D.

Chairman: The Rev. T. Jalland, D.D. (Anglican).

8 p.m. ST. THOMAS AND CHRISTIAN TRADITION.

Speaker: The Rev. Father Victor White, O.P.

Chairman: Dr. Eugene Lampert (Orthodox).

Sunday, December 10th.

9.45 a.m. DIALOGUE MASS (at the Old Palace, St. Aldate's).

11.30 a.m. PLATONISM AS A VITAL FORCE IN CHRISTIAN
THEOLOGY.

Speaker: Professor Hilary Armstrong.

Chairman: Charles Vereker (Anglican).

2.30 p.m. INTEGRAL CATHOLICISM AND THE *E.C.Q.*

Speaker: Dom Bede Winslow.

Chairman: Christopher Dawson.

The following are the first two articles. The others will be published in our next issue.

The Liturgy and Christian Unity

With recollections of the bitter controversies over liturgy—and the smaller the matter, the more bitter the quarrel—of the battle of surplice *versus* Geneva gown, of the recriminations between East and West over such matters as leavened or unleavened bread, of fasting on Saturdays and the wearing or not wearing of beards, it may seem paradoxical to suggest that the liturgy is the centre of unity. Yet that is what I do suggest and hope to show in this paper. Its purpose is to disclose the fundamental meaning of liturgy, its content rather than its form. However, it would be well to remark here that liturgy, since it is public worship, must have a form as well as a content, a body as well as a soul, and that the form the liturgy may take among this or that people, at this or that time, is not a matter of indifference for it is a manifestation of the soul, a "sacrament." It is not very helpful to suggest that the fundamental reality of all worship is the same, that the Sacred Dances of Borneo (if they sacredly dance in Borneo) are fundamentally the same thing as the grave choreography of a Papal High Mass—which may be true—it is precisely these differing "sacramental" manifestations that need understanding and explaining, and this can only be done by a profound understanding of the content of the liturgy in the first place, for to a great extent the external form is dictated, by an inner logic, by the content itself. Presumably no one nowadays confuses liturgy with ceremonial or aesthetics or mere archeology. To such, if there be such, this paper will be without interest.

Rightly understood, the liturgical approach to the problems of reunion is the most fundamental of the many possible and necessary approaches that can be made. The intellectual approach of theology, the factual of history, the legal of Canon Law, all of high practical importance, are concerned with a mental level of existence while the liturgy is concerned with being and life. Moreover, all the others are ordered to the liturgy as to their centre and source and are means to the ultimate end, namely, that all the scattered parts and elements of Christianity may be re-integrated into the *Christus totus*. (In parenthesis, it is not without interest to observe that the Liturgical Movement has had and continues to have an important influence on theology. If there is a synthetic and Christocentric re-orientation of modern theology this is largely due to the Liturgical Movement. The integral view of reality fostered by the liturgy has reduced controversy to its proper proportions and has led to the calm exposition of the great positive content of theology. However, it is probably a case of reciprocal causality ; one thing has influenced another.)

To look at Christian unity from the viewpoint of the liturgy is to see the whole matter from the centre and to be aware of the burning need to restore all things in Christ. For the liturgy is Christ, *Christus totus*, head and members, and not a static Christ but Christ active, Christ praying, Christ offering the supreme act of sacrifice to his Father, Christ redeeming. Thus the liturgy is the unifying force of the Mystical Body. If we remember the pregnant meaning of *signum*, we can see that St. Thomas was saying but this in his Secret Prayer of the Mass of Corpus Christi: "Be pleased to grant to thy Church, Lord, we pray, the gifts of unity and peace which are sacramentally (*mystice*) signified by these gifts we offer thee."

In all sacrificial worship there is a vertical and a horizontal movement, both of which aim at union.

The whole purpose of sacrifice is union with God. The gift we offer, the thing we transfer to God's possession is the *sacrum signum*, at once significant and efficacious, of our interior sacrifice of praise, thanksgiving, repentance and the rest. We immolate this thing, destroy it, render it useless, change it in some way to show that we too wish to make ourselves over utterly to God. We are seeking union with him who is the last end and beatitude of man. In the acceptance of the victim by God is the first moment of the union of the victim with

God. Then as a pledge of divine acceptance, there is the return of the victim, charged with divine riches, and this is the second moment of union, the communion of man with the victim, and so of communion with his fellows.¹

All this dimly foreshadowed by pre-Christian sacrifices is brought to perfection in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, the mediator between God and men. All the sacrifices of the Old Testament were vain because of the barrier of sin. Christ by his redeeming death, wrought in obedience and love, broke down the wall of partition and by offering once and for all the only acceptable sacrifice, made expiation for the sins of men and so re-united mankind to God. But he did not enter alone into this sacrifice. He was the representative of the human race for he is solidary with us first by reason of his human nature, he is the head of the human race, and secondly, by his death he acquired to himself a new people: "Christ loved the church and delivered himself up for it." Moreover, the merits, the fruits of his redemption are of avail to us precisely because he was the head of the Body and we, as St. Thomas says, form one mystical person with him. We are only redeemed in so far as we are incorporated into his Body. So by his death he drew us up to God, drew us all to himself and thus to one another.

The Mass is the sacrifice of Christ and the sacrifice of the Mystical Body. It is the supreme act of that Body, the dynamic centre of its unity, and it is through the Mass that the effects of Christ's redemption are made actual in us.

By transubstantiation, as Canon Masure makes so clear, the Church is put in possession of Christ and so of Christ's sacrifice, that is of Christ in all the phases of his redeeming activity. "He is not laid upon our altars, like the victims of sacrifices now outworn, passive and resigned, playing the part of a sign at the brutal bidding of a foreign master. On the contrary, he it is who is still the animating force of the great movement of which he was the principal, prolonging it to the end of the earth and in man's hearts. The creator of religion, the author of grace, the source of salvation, redemption itself in his own Person, he acts potently upon all those who choose him as their victim, or rather those to whom he has offered himself as victim and oblation. In his immolated state he is more than ever our Head; for he sustains us by his Presence and his action. He is a victim, yes, but a

¹ For all this see Masure, *The Christian Sacrifice*, p. 47.

life-giving victim, who gives worth to those who immolate him instead of receiving from them his value and significance. So St. John saw him in the Apocalypse as the mystic Lamb, immolated but omnipotent, giving life to the world, the centre of human history and of divine religion, the extraordinary victim who does not undertake for others their wishes and intentions but communicates to them on the contrary all his own spiritual wealth."¹ The Real Presence is not the pale static thing it is so often imagined to be. The consecration is a dynamic moment when Christ is most active, when he lifts up all creation to heaven and the Most High enters into union with the lowliest of his creatures. At that moment he is welding his Body into an ever closer unity, drawing it up to God and sending into its every part great waves of divine life. By the words of consecration Christ is made present in all the phases of his redeeming activity which (without going into the disputed question of the redemptive value of all Christ's actions) includes Passion, Resurrection and Ascension, and thus communicates to the whole Mystical Body an influx of new life. The whole process of his sacrifice from the solemn presenting of the Victim in the Supper to the acceptance and consummation of the sacrifice at the Ascension is concentrated in that one vital moment of consecration. This is made clear by the Canon of the Mass, for at the words of institution Christ speaks, Christ acts, and the Supper with all its sacrificial overtones is recalled. And in the *Anamnesis* the whole process is recapitulated: "Wherefore, O Lord, we thy servants and also thy holy people recalling the blessed Passion of Christ thy Son, his Resurrection from hell and his glorious Ascension into heaven, offer to thy illustrious majesty out of the bounty of thy own gifts (*de tuis donis ac datis*), a pure victim, a holy victim, a spotless victim, the holy bread of eternal life and the chalice of everlasting salvation." It is significant that St. Thomas in his single all-too-brief article (IIa, 83, a.1.) on the sacrifice of the Mass should quote the powerful Secret Prayer of the ninth Sunday after Pentecost: Grant us, Lord, we beseech thee, worthily to approach these mysteries, for as often as we celebrate the memorial of this sacrifice, the work of our redemption is wrought in us: "*quia quoties huius hostiae commemoratio celebratur, opus nostrae redemptionis exercetur.*" And what is the "work of our redemption"

¹ Masure, *op. cit.* pp. 282, 283.

if not union with God and union with our fellow men in Christ? This union wrought, made actual at the consecration is brought to completion in holy communion. For the three great moments of the Mass are not so much separate actions as phases of a single act. At the offertory we do the necessary human minimum by presenting the gifts, the material of the sacrifice. At the consecration they are changed and become the divine Victim. Signs of our interior worship and symbols of ourselves, of our longings and our needs, they are taken up by Christ and we with them are presented to his eternal Father. Because Jesus Christ is the Priest and the Victim, the perfect and acceptable sacrifice, we achieve our first moment of union. As a pledge of divine love, our gifts are returned to us, transformed now into life-bearing gifts as holy communion. Thus we achieve the second moment of union. As St. Thomas loved to say, thus summing up the whole ancient tradition of the Church, the Eucharist is the sacrament of the Church's unity, its principal effect (*res*) is the unity of the Mystical Body (IIIa, 73, aa. 2, 3, 4). The liturgy bears witness to the same view, and characteristically by an action, in the ceremony of the Pax before holy communion.

The fundamental rhythm of the Canon shows forth this view of the liturgy in its own inimitable way. There is the ascent to God in the offering of the gifts "through Jesus Christ thy Son Our Lord," and then the prayer continues gathering into its wide sweep the whole Church; we offer the sacrifice for "thy Holy Catholic Church" and pray that through it she may be protected, unified and given peace: we pray for the Pope and our bishop, for all believers in the apostolic faith throughout the world. At the *Mementos* we gather to us the living and the dead and in the *Communicantes* we remind ourselves that we are *acting in union with* Our Lady, the Apostles, the martyrs and all the saints, a theme that appears again in the *Nobis quoque peccatoribus* as an explicit prayer for union. Then begins in the *Hanc igitur* and *Quam oblationem* the urgent, almost hurried prayer for the acceptance and ratification of our sacrifice and after that we enter into the calm centre of reality, love and union and peace. The intense moment wherein all reality is concentrated, is unfolded in the *Unde et memores*, and we are carried almost in a mood of ecstasy to the culminating point where everything is drawn into Christ, and all through him, in a passion of adoration, is centred upon God: *Per ipsum, et cum ipso, et in ipso, est tibi Deo Patri omnipotenti in unitate Spiritus*

*Sancti, omnis honor et gloria, per omnia saecula saeculorum. Amen.*¹

It will be agreed, I imagine, that such a view of the liturgy, synthetic and dynamic, will foster a like attitude to the whole of reality in which everything will find its proper place and a congenial home. It shows that all must be brought to the Centre to be integrated there and that all Christian effort must spring forth from the Centre. That is why the liturgy must be the basis of all that is summed up under the name of Catholic Action, whether it be social reform, Christian co-operation or re-union. But what is more important and what I would wish to emphasise is that the Mass is the centripetal force of the Church, maintaining its unity and drawing its members into an ever closer union with the Head. Of course by sin, selfishness, and all kinds of exclusivism we can diminish the effects of that unifying action in ourselves or others but nevertheless, *it* remains. So then, our task is to live as close as possible to the Centre of unity. *Hoc opus, hic labor est!* Granted, but it is the first and most fundamental contribution to Christian Unity.

It would be interesting to work out applications of this view of the liturgy, to show how conscious the early Church was of it, to show how the early sacramentaries associated all the sacraments with the Mass, a matter to which St. Thomas, as usual following well-founded tradition, merely gave precise theological formulation in the *Summa*. We see in the ancient ceremony of the *Fractio panis* when the Pope sent the particle of the Host to his neighbouring bishops, the deep conviction that the Church's unity is sustained by the Eucharist. Excommunication meant very literally separation from Christ in the Mass. A word may be spared for the Divine Office, once inseparably united to the Mass, in which the manifold riches of Christ's redeeming activity are unfolded to us during the day and by which we are able to put ourselves in the way of the flood of divine life sent forth for the sanctification of the day from the morning Mass. Finally, we may mention the Liturgical Year wherein we are able to live with Christ in the changing phases of his redeeming activity and thus continue the process of our incorporation in him. Thus we see the diastolé and systolé of Christian reality, the perpetual movement of life from the

¹ It could be shown that this is the fundamental rhythm of all liturgies and in the discussion after this paper one or two speakers bore witness to the fact. The writer of this paper refrained from what might have seemed an obvious duty to use the comparative method, partly because, in such delicate matters, a living experience of other liturgies would seem to be an essential condition of such treatment.

Centre to the periphery and the inevitable return of all things to their Centre.

Or we can see in all this a solution of the ancient problem of the One and the Many. For it is not to any arithmetical unity that all things are called but to integration in the living, varied, many-levelled unity of an organism, the Body of Christ. Each one by submitting to the organic action of this Body, far from losing his identity or being absorbed in the general mass, now achieves the purpose of his being, union with God, his last end, and the enhancement of his true personality. Here in the Body, into which he is inserted by the Mass, he finds his place, and his proper function, and he realises that if all the members are necessary for the *pleroma* of the Body, not all are equally important. Here he finds harmony, the subordination of member to member, order and hierarchy, all inspired and sustained by the Head, Christ. Here, living at the Centre and by the Centre, he can view all reality, all the manifold riches of life as infinitely varied reflections of the Truth and Goodness and Beauty of God.

This view of the Church implies that it is a unity-in-diversity and that a crushing uniformity is not the Catholic ideal. This is shown by the Church's intense concern for a native clergy in the mission fields, by her encouragement of native art and culture and by the respect she shows for all native customs that are not incompatible with Christianity. Similarly the Papacy, even when others have been less conscientious, has upheld the right of the various Eastern Churches to the use of their own rites and liturgical languages, and, indeed, on occasion, has had to discourage them from adopting Roman customs in their worship.¹ Further, where special conditions and difficulties have demanded it, the Church has shown herself to be astonishingly accommodating (as it may seem to some) in the matter of the language that the liturgy might be celebrated in (e.g. vernacular in parts of Rumania).² For any adequate appreciation, then, of the "uni-diversity" of the Church and of the varied richness of her life, the Eastern rites which enjoy full *droit de cité*, must be included. (Incidentally, Eastern Catholics communicate under both kinds and if, say, a Greek Orthodox made his submission to the Pope, he would

¹ See, e.g. Fortescue, *Uniate Eastern Churches*. Constitution of Benedict XIV, p. 33. (London, 1923.)

² For details, see Salaville, *An Introduction to the Study of Eastern Liturgies*, p. 43. (London, 1938.)

not have to change his *rite*. A striking example of this was the conversion of Mar Ivanios who went on celebrating his Syriac Rite of St. James without change.)

With one or two practical considerations this paper may well be brought to a conclusion.

The liturgy has, as I have hoped to show, a certain content, truly Christian and scriptural which is largely unembarrassed by later philosophical speculations. It still breathes the air of the early Church before unfortunate controversies and schisms broke up the unity of Christendom. It is universalist in outlook and yet, in tune with all Catholic thought, preferring the both-and to the either-or, rejoices in a diversity in unity. This is the mentality it teaches us, an indispensable one to anyone concerned with the problems of Christian Unity. To acquire it the liturgy must be lived and the reward is that such an outlook becomes incarnated in our personalities. That is the way to acquire Christian wisdom. *Sapientis est ordinare*. The wise man can put all things in order.

The liturgy shows the true face of the Church—*Lex orandi legem statuit credendi*—and so the Liturgical Movement has an important contribution to make to Christian Unity from this point of view. Many aspects of Catholic devotion and practice whose ceaseless proliferation shows that the Church is a living, growing and dynamic organism, can only be properly understood when seen from the Centre.

Lastly, is it always realised that in the Mass we are in communion with all men in good faith and of good will throughout the world, the invisible members of Christ's Mystical Body? If we remember that by the action of the Mass they are actually being drawn into closer unity with us and that from the centre of the Mass there are going out to them great pulses of saving grace, then we see the really central place that the liturgy and indeed all prayer must have in all efforts to restore Christian Unity. Here the barriers of custom, of misunderstandings, of theological differences, of prejudice and of all that divides are down and we meet all men of good will in Christ. Whether they are conscious of this or not, does not matter, but *we* ought to be and it should be a constant incentive to us to use the infinite resources of the liturgy to restore them to full and visible union with Christ.

J. D. CRICHTON.

Apart from my obvious debt to St. Thomas, I should like to acknowledge my debt to Masure's *Christian Sacrifice* (London, 1944), to Dom Theodore Wesseling's *Liturgy and Life* (London, 1938) and to two articles of his in *Magnificat*, Vol. III, No. 1, 1940, and Vol. III, No. 2, 1941. J.D.C

The Study of Church History and Christian Reunion

Much as the size and the difficulty of the subject of this paper exceed the limits of a short study, its very importance has helped me to overcome my hesitation and to endeavour to show at least in a bare outline, however imperfectly, the support and profit which the notion of Christian Reunion may derive from the study of Church history. The crisis which our race is facing in these difficult times calls for the mobilisation of all the available spiritual forces that have so far survived the onslaught of materialism and its inroads into the human mind call for all possible concentration. Unfortunately the forces on which we might rely are split : the mists of disunion and misunderstanding dim the light that can only come from Our Lord's teaching and should guide our footsteps. The least then we can do is to dispel those mists by trying to bring about a better understanding between the different Churches and bodies that claim to be the authentic guardians of Our Lord's message. If Church history can be helpful in this direction, it should be explored to the utmost.

I.

It will probably sound strange to many that we should try to use Church history as a means to promote Christian Reunion, and we admit that the tactics are unusual. This difficult problem is mostly tackled from a theological angle in an endeavour to explain, defend or render acceptable to other Christian communities such of our doctrines as we disagree upon. Or else, we study the ritual and liturgical differences, especially between the Western and the Eastern Churches, with a view to understand their origin and their spirit or to propose such alterations as would appeal to the Easterners, as for instance the insertion of the Epiklesis into the Mass formulary. And there remains in any case the pragmatic way, so often adopted, of prayers in common, social connections, practical acts of Christian charity, mutual help in distress and such like activities.

All these methods are regarded as valuable contributions to a better understanding between Christian communities and to the softening of our respective prejudices : but Church history ! Are we then to start all over again marshalling the endless procession of heretics whose misdeeds fill the pages of

our handbooks of Church history? And everybody knows how indigestible those pages are. Where shall we find the braves able to summon the pluck to plunge cheerfully into the heretical tangle that obscured the first centuries of Church evolution and to pick out for analysis Arians and Semi-Arians, Monophysites, Monothelites, Nestorians, with a host of minor heretical sects? or to count all the numerous synods that were held to combat or support those heresies; or to wade through the learned treatises connected with those theological movements? Most of us will say: Well, that was the East and that was the history of the Eastern Churches. And this is in fact how many pictured the East, as though we Westerners had nothing to do with all that devilish work, but carried on piously and righteously, whilst the Easterners racked their brains in the invention of new heresies. Of course, we did admit that there were some Eastern Fathers who gallantly fought for the orthodoxy of the faith; but had it not been for the intervention of the Popes, the whole East would have sunk bodily into heresy.

And as we come to the period when the West also slipped into heresy, somehow out-Easted the East and created a multitude of creeds, Churches and sects, which still go on multiplying to this very day, are we expected, in the interests of a rapprochement, to try the historical method on them, too? to study all the reformers one after another, the history of the countries concerned, the reactions of the Catholics and go again through the whole gamut of religious wars, martyrdoms, mutual recriminations and persecutions which are part of the history of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation? No doubt, a deeper knowledge of these events is necessary and we are far from knowing them as well as we should. But this sort of Church history will not bring the various Christian bodies very much nearer to each other. As a matter of fact, Church history has been treated in this manner ever since it was made a special department of historical science and in spite of progress made and a better knowledge of isolated periods in the Christian past, little advance is registered in the rapprochement between Christian Churches.

On the contrary, one sometimes gathers the impression that specialisation, the favourite slogan of modern historians, when applied to Church history, too often tends to intensify the process of estrangement between the different Christian bodies, every one of them creating its own Church history

Church History and Christian Reunion 19

and insisting on its own idiosyncracies, its own leaders, theologians and organisations.

As regards the text books of general Church history, they are mostly stuffed with theology in the shape of dogmatic disquisitions, refutations of heretical tenets, accounts of ecclesiastical institutions and policies, canon law, philosophy and its developments, liturgy and archeology. No wonder that Church history has so far done little to promote Christian reunion and that it sounds paradoxical to seek the cure for our disunion in the history of beliefs, heresies and schisms.

But is that the only way to treat Church history? And if not, what method should we follow and which problems should we study to promote the idea that all Christians should once more be united in one Church and under the leadership of one supreme head, the successor of St. Peter? I must insist again that adequate answers to these questions and suggestions could be endless and that it cannot be my intention, as it is beyond my power and my knowledge, to indicate new methods in the study of the history of the Church or of anything else. Nor could I intend to enumerate all the problems that bear on Reunion and whose knowledge would be apt to promote reconciliation between the Churches. They are far too many and any of them would be the result of purely personal preference and would lack universal application. All I can do is to put forward a few suggestions, some of them based on my own experience, others rather as guesses whose usefulness would need the test of practical application.

II.

First of all with regard to the historical method in general, it seems to me that we have so far rather neglected the national element in the study of Christian evolution. From our own Christian standpoint, it is unthinkable that it was ever Our Lord's intention to let all national individualities be submerged for ever under the saving grace of His teaching and that all tendencies to lend an individual, national character to His Church should be suppressed. We do acknowledge this principle in theory, but are rather reluctant to lend it its full value and implication in actual practice. In Church history, we are only too loath to admit that the national principle took a large share in the shaping of the external appearance of primitive Christianity. No doubt, we are perfectly entitled to stress the universality of the Church, the necessity of one

Head and a common leadership, but is there not a feeling that we are sometimes too much inclined to confuse universality with uniformity?

This tendency is especially common among Roman Catholic Church historians and it is easily explained how it developed and took such solid roots in Catholic mentality. We need only to remember the aftermath of the greatest crisis which Western Christianity had to face at the time of the so-called Reformation: the impression which Catholics gathered from this experience is that the principle of national individuality in the Church was carried too far by the Reformers, so far, indeed, that its universality was well nigh obliterated. This finding naturally makes every Catholic feel cautious and diffident whenever any practical application of the national principle in the Church comes up for discussion.

The pity is that these apprehensions have mystified many historians and made them blind to the fact that it was perhaps the neglect of the national element by the pre-Reformation Church in the West that contributed to the violent reaction brought about by the Reformers. This I attempted at least to some extent to show in my recent booklet on the *National Churches and the Church Universal*,¹ and I seize this opportunity to call attention to this problem again. It may not sound attractive to some who have been familiar since their childhood with one single aspect of Christianity, but it is vital for us to set aside our aversion and see how far a Christian can go in giving rein to the national element and let it manifest its individuality in the Church. I have tried to prove that one of the leading features of primitive Christianity was precisely that it laid everywhere the first foundations of the universal edifice of the Church on a national plan.

If then in the study of the history of the Church we allow for this outlook more generously, we shall find there an answer to many a problem that has preoccupied the minds of historians and even Churchmen such as were mainly interested in the practical direction of ecclesiastical life; more particularly, answers to the questions as to what place the vernacular can be given in the liturgy and how it came about that Latin became the dominant liturgical language in the West. We might by the same token derive some profit from the experiences, felicitous or otherwise, which a more generous application of the national principle has provided in the evolution of the

¹ Dacre Press, London, 1944. Also see *E.C.Q.*, July—December, 1943.

Church History and Christian Reunion 21

Eastern Churches and be ready to admit that in this matter, as in many others, the East has preserved one particular principle of primitive Christianity more faithfully. Another result would be a better appreciation of the growth of Western Christianity and the discovery that in one aspect the Reformation was a revolt of the national element against the principle of universality stretched to breaking point and too closely identified with the notion of uniformity. At the same time, certain features of the Western national Churches and some of their principles which still facilitate the diffusion of some obviously heretical tenets would be placed in a different light.

Those Western Christian bodies which severed themselves from the Roman Church and the spiritual Mother of the West draw justification for their attitude from the fact that only the Reformers did justice to the claims of national feeling among the various Western nations as they reached manhood under the stimulant of the Renaissance; and the attitude which the Roman Church still maintains with regard to the use of national languages in worship lends the pretext a semblance of plausibility.

But this is not the whole truth. Church history reveals that the Reformers only took advantage of, and precipitated, a process which was in full swing before ever they appeared on the scene. Already the interest which the new middle classes, as represented by the burghers in the cities, took in literature and in theology had blossomed into vernacular translations of the Bible, vernacular hymns and theological treatises. The process was slow, too slow perhaps, but steady none the less and would have inevitably led to a change of orientation towards the use of the vernacular in worship within the Roman Church but for the Reformers' doctrinal revolution, which stopped all further progress in that quarter and stiffened the Catholic attitude. Too many interests of more vital importance were thrown into the melting-pot all at once and the use of the vernacular in the liturgy became the symbol of doctrinal revolt.

Now, a better understanding of this evolution should induce Protestants to estimate Rome's attitude with better comprehension and Catholics to reconsider their attitude in the same respect. Roman Catholics would at the same time feel better equipped to appeal to the dissident bodies and the Eastern Churches for their return to the Fold and a wider acceptance of the principle of universality such as in Our Lord's intention

was to be the principal feature of His Church, however much it was discarded by some, and by others relegated to the background.

Studied from this angle, Church history also reveals why some of our missionary efforts have not yielded their expected results: we failed to follow the example of the first missionaries of the primitive Church and grudged to mission lands the national element they had a right to. Rights and liberties we gave in theory, but in too many cases we only imitated the colonising methods of the great Western Powers in the Middle and Far East and in Africa by imposing on the native converts a foreign clergy, foreign customs and foreign architecture, whilst discarding native elements that needed only adaptation and elaboration, unlike the primitive Church which carefully preserved what was good in the inheritance from pagan days, transformed the pagan temples into places of Christian worship, built new ones after the roman national style of the pagan Basilicas or official State buildings and erected its theological system on the philosophical foundations laid down by Greek pagan thinkers.

III.

Another principle that deserves consideration, if we wish to make Church history helpful in the work of reunion, is to go back as far as possible to the sources of any fact disputed by Christians and not to rest content with the prevailing opinion on any subject. We must remember that Church history reached its flourishing condition only in the last hundred and fifty years, its foundations having been laid in the sixteenth century at the time of the Protestant Reformation and the Catholic Counter-Reformation. It is only natural that the first Church historians studied mainly the questions that were of interest to the Christians of their day and that their research and work were marred by apologetic bias. This created the obvious danger that they overlooked some aspects of the problems they were dealing with and that their opinions may have prevented others from studying the same problems from another angle in the light of discoveries made since.

An almost classical example illustrating how history can be misread and how misrepresentation is liable to raise obstacles in the way of reunion is the case of the Patriarch Photius. The first complete history of this great figure of the Oriental Church was written by Cardinal Caesar Baronius (1538-1607), the

founder of Catholic Church history in the sixteenth century. His monumental work, the *Annales Ecclesiastici* (1588-1607), was intended to be the Catholic reply to the famous *Centuriæ Magdeburgenses*, the first serious attempt at introducing a systematic order into Church history by dividing it into centuries. The impetuous Croat, Vlasic, known as Mathias Flaccius Illyricus (1520-1575), and his collaborators wrote their comprehensive and imposing work to establish by historical arguments that the Reformation had only achieved what had been often attempted in vain or with partial success by many holy men during past centuries in their revolts against the papacy and the Church of Rome. The work merits a special place in the history of Christianity for its pioneering originality and the influence it wielded on the minds of Western Christians in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, though to-day it makes rather curious and, at times, amusing reading, now that the facts are better known. It is clear that the authors were in many instances reading Church history backwards and attributing their own new-fangled notions to past generations. Photius of course was given a place of honour in the gallery of rebels, since he was taken to be one of the doughtiest opponents of the Roman papacy among the Easterners.

As Baronius was out to refute the Protestants' allegations, he considered it his obvious duty to portray the wicked Patriarch in the most lurid colours : a man who could so flagrantly challenge orders from Rome could be nothing else but the incarnation of evil and malignity. The Cardinal took Photius' rebellion against the primacy of St. Peter's successor for granted and considered his assumption amply justified by documents that were only partly known to Flaccius and his collaborators, but which he was the first to consult at first hand and to publish from the Archives of the Holy See to which he had free access. Those documents had been written by monks apparently reputed for a holiness that was again taken for granted, since they were so devoted to the Holy See, persistently accused Photius in Rome and insisted on the condemnation of a Patriarch who embodied the pride, astuteness and wickedness of Lucifer. Baronius was also the first to utilise the Acts of the Eighth Council and of the Photian Council in their Greek edition as well as the so-called Life of St. Ignatius written by Nicetas of Paphlagonia, who also must have been a holy man, since he could write so nicely about the poor Patriarch, the victim of the wicked Photius. The truth is

that Nicetas was Photius' bitterest opponent and his *Life* of St. Ignatius neither better nor worse than a politico-religious pamphlet of very slight biographical merit.

One can understand how under the circumstances Baronius was led into error. The documents looked perfectly trustworthy; the historical method was only in its teens at the time he was writing; the critical spirit was only just awakened by the discoveries of the Renaissance period, yet not sharpened enough to discern the subtle differences between genuine and spurious documents; and above all, there was the fact that all the actions of Photius had been condemned by an oecumenical Council, the eighth on the list, which had been assiduously quoted in all the Western Collections of canon law from the eleventh century and had been given pride of place in the *Decretum Gratiani*, the indispensable handbook of every Western Churchman. And so, a Legend was created and credited down to our own days.

That the Easterners never numbered eight but seven Councils and venerated Photius in association with Ignatius as a saint only deepened the Catholics' distrust in the Eastern Church and raised a new obstruction to mutual understanding, each side claiming to be right and deploring the blindness of the opposition that could mistake such absurdities for the truth. To safeguard the Uniats against such evil and save them from the falsehood they had so long entertained, a special oath was drawn up for the benefit of the Orthodox who joined the Roman Catholic Church making them condemn the rebellious Patriarch Photius and all his falsehoods and accept the Eighth Council, which had condemned the Patriarch, as oecumenical.¹

Since then, the name of Photius has become a battle-cry that has enlivened every encounter between the Roman—especially Greco—Catholics and the Orthodox, eventually developing into the most serious obstacle to any rapprochement between Catholics and Orthodox; involving not only the question of orthodoxy, Photius being alleged to have been the first to challenge the Filioque, but also the papal primacy, Photius being appealed to as the champion of all schismatics, and morality, since the Orthodox venerate as a saint a man notorious for his pride, his lust for power, his unjust deposition of a rightful Patriarch and his brutal persecution of holy men.

Baronius was not alone responsible for the origin of this

¹ Mansi, *Conciliorum Collectio*, Vol. XXXV, col. 143 sq.

legend, for he only codified what had been gradually taking shape during the Middle Ages from the eleventh century onwards. He had several predecessors who influenced him, but he was primarily responsible for the new lease of life which the legend enjoyed after the publication of his *Annals*. This was something new, for there are many documents dating from different periods of the Middle Ages which indicate that the minds of the Westerners were not always as positive with regard to Photius as they are now. As an instance, we can quote the Acts of the Council of Florence. Cardinal Cesarini who presided was very much embarrassed when confronted by the arguments of the opposition and he met the protests from the Greeks by assuring them that no quotation from the Acts of the Eighth Council would be admitted in the debates.¹ The case of Photius was simply left in abeyance, or rather ignored, and even the papal Chancellery gave its tacit consent to the designation of the Council of Florence as the Eighth Oecumenical.²

The first writer to see through the case was the Protestant historian and promoter of Byzantine studies, M. Hancke, who in his book, *De Byzantinarum Rerum Scriptoris Graecis Liber*, published in Leipzig in 1677, was the first to point out that the documents used by Baronius as absolute evidence for his deductions were not as trustworthy as they looked and should be handled with care, since they had been written by Photius' enemies, were biased and self-contradictory. Hancke did not succeed in probing the controversy to the bottom, but it was very remarkable how deftly he elaborated at such an early period the critical historical method in the use of his historical sources.

¹ Mansi, l.c., Vol. XXXI, col. 551, 553. Read the intervention of the Latin archbishop of Rhodes, *ibid.*, col. 590 sq.

² The Greek bishop Bartholomew Abraham of Crete translated the Greek Acts of the Council—the only ones preserved, as the Latin Acts were lost—in an abridged form and addressed them to the archbishop of Ravenna who had taken an interest in the edition. The Acts were reprinted in Mansi, l.c., Vol. XXXI, col. 179 sq. When Abraham of Crete asked Pope Clement VII (1523–1534) for permission to proceed with the publication of his work, the papal chancellery approved at the same time the designation of Eighth Oecumenical Council conferred by the translator on the Council of Florence. Laurentius Surius left the designation in his edition of the Councils (1567) and contented himself with expressing his misgiving. It was only in 1606 that S. Bini suppressed in his edition of the Councils the title given to the Florentine Synod by Abraham of Crete and called it the Sixteenth Oecumenical. These details are not always given the prominence they deserve.

Hancke's arguments did not prevail against the avalanche of dialectics that had poured from Baronius' pen, but he found some followers among Protestants and in the controversy that ensued Photius' name became a shibboleth which Protestant and Catholic historians flourished in each other's face, the Catholics holding on to Baronius and the Protestants trying to show that whatever his mistakes, Photius was not anything as bad as he was painted and had the merit of seeing and unveiling to the Christian world the evil of papalism. Meanwhile, the Orthodox stood aside and went on quietly saying their prayers to St. Photius.

In a way, their writers did succumb to the appeal of Baronius' reasoning. They accepted Photius' second excommunication by Pope John VIII, as there seemed no escape from Baronius' plausible evidence, but only because it fitted into their own picture and added lustre to the halo of a saintly patriarch who had so grievously suffered at the hands of the Latins.

Such contradictory standpoints called for a revision of the whole case and this was attempted by another cardinal, J. Hergenröther in his work, *Photius, Patriarch von Konstantinopel, sein Leben, seine Schriften und das Griechische Schisma* (*Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople; His Life, his Writings and the Greek Schism*), published in three volumes at Regensburg in 1861-69. He discovered some new sources bearing on the period, re-published Photius' letters (Migne's *Patrology*, Vol. 102) and threw all these materials into the balance only to confirm and to complete the picture drawn by his great predecessor Baronius, with the exception of a few minor re-touches. Hergenröther's work, done according to all the canons of the modern critical method as developed especially by the Germans, seemed to clinch the Photian controversy so conclusively that his opinion has prevailed to our day. Even the Orthodox felt uneasy in their refutations of the cardinal's arguments, as may be seen in the works of the most widely read Russian Church historian, A. P. Lebedev. Only an unknown and humble hieromonach, Gerazim Yared, of Syriac origin, had the daring to write a complete refutation of the cardinal's thesis in the Chtenia of the Theological Academy of Kiev (1872). He tried to defend the old Photian tradition of the Eastern Church and the tradition on the number of Councils and succeeded in many ways, if not in vindicating the true facts, at least in pointing out that the two cardinals' demonstration had its weaknesses and did not deserve the ready

acceptance it had secured everywhere. But his was a voice calling in the wilderness. The monk was silenced by the learned professor of Petrograd, Lebedev, who could not brook the idea of being put in the shade by this obscure friar. As to Hergenröther, it is unlikely that the cardinal ever learnt that a Syriac monk had dared to criticise in Russian a solid German work: he considered the debate closed, not to the advantage of the Patriarch and Christian Reunion.

To appreciate Hergenröther's work, one should remember that he was writing at the time the Vatican definition of the Primacy was being elaborated, and being a keen theologian, he was naturally on the look out for whatever could buttress the definition. In Germany, this mentality was intensified by the Protestant opposition and by the anti-Catholic tendency, later embodied in the *Los von Rom* movement. Writing in this atmosphere and under its influence, it looks as though the learned professor was carried away by his desire to defend the Primacy and failed to see in the history of Photius certain aspects that rather favoured it, though not in a manner that appealed to many a member of the Vatican Council.

This is not the place to enter into details or to show how the history of Photius and of the so-called eighth oecumenical council was gradually obscured to give place to the legendary tradition as codified by Baronius and Hergenröther. This I hope to achieve more satisfactorily in my book on the Photian Schism which has been waiting for its publisher since 1940. The Photian Legend makes interesting history and I trust that one day it will be quoted as the classical instance in Church history of how a legend starts, grows and expands. As I pointed out in a lecture given at Blackfriars in Oxford and published in 1942,¹ as also in some studies published before the war,² the whole mistake was due to the canonists of the

¹ *The Patriarch Photius, Father of Schism or Patron of Reunion?* (Report of the Proceedings at the Unity Octave, Oxford, 1942.) See also our study, *East and West—The Photian Schism: A Restatement of Facts* (*The Month*, Vol. CLXXIX, 1943.)

² I published some of the most important findings on this subject mostly in the review *Byzantion* (Vol. VIII, 1933: *Le Second Schisme de Photios—Une Mystification Historique*; Vol. XI, 1936: *Études sur Photios*). The questions concerning the deposition of Ignatius and the election of Photius I discussed in 1935 in the *Bulletin* of the Bulgarian Archeological Institute, Vol. IX. On the Eighth Council, see especially our study published in the *Bulletin* of the Royal Academy of Belgium, Vol. XXIV, 1938—*L'Oecuménicité du VIII^e Concile dans la Littérature Latine du Moyen Age*.

Gregorian and post-Gregorian period who in their excitement on finding in the so-called eighth oecumenical council a canon (the 28th) which forbade the laity to meddle with the elections of bishops and patriarchs, the very thing they needed at the first stage of the Investiture Contest, promoted that council to the first rank among all the oecumenical synods, overlooking the fact that the same council was cancelled ten years after it was held, when Photius made his peace with the Holy See, and that the annulment was sanctioned and confirmed by Pope John VIII. On going through the first Collections of the new Canon Law inspired by Gregory VII, one is surprised to see some of those canonists quoting both documents, the Acts of the Eighth Council together with the canon of the Photian Council which was confirmed by the Pope and cancelled the Eighth Council. The last canonist to do this, not however without feeling perplexed by the contradiction, was St. Ivo of Chartres. But Gratian, who had not the qualifications of his predecessors and had no access to the original documents, left out of his Collection the canon that annulled the Eighth Council. That did not trouble him, since his purpose was to attempt to reconcile discordant canons, and as he came up against two canons that were exceptionally discordant, he suppressed the one that sounded less trustworthy to him, and that was of course the canon of the Photian Council which declared an important council to be null and void. However, he still included in his Collection one canon of the Photian Synod, evidence that at that time the Photian Council was not yet regarded as Pseudo-Synodus, as it was declared to be in the seventeenth century by the first editor of its Acts, J. Hardouin.

And that is how the stone started rolling. It is amazing to see, for instance, how some medieval canonists were puzzled by the inclusion in Gratian's Collection of a canon quoted from the Photian Council: they did not know what to make of it. Innocent III, one of the best of them, thought, when he quoted this canon, that it had been voted at one of the great oecumenical councils: he had already completely lost notion of any council that had rehabilitated Photius. Such ignorance must have influenced the first historians of Photius and induced them to give unqualified credence to the documents of Photius' enemies and their venomous portraiture of the Patriarch. The following process can be easily imagined. The Acts of the Photian Council which rehabilitated Photius

had of necessity to be declared apocryphical, or at least held to be untrustworthy, since it contradicted a Council considered oecumenical and held in the highest esteem throughout the West. A second excommunication of Photius was all the more readily accepted, since it was hinted at in the writings of Photius' enemies and was considered to be the best expedient to save the credit of Pope John VIII, if there was any truth in a statement by the Photian Council that he had received Photius into communion. The fact that the papal letters were read to the Photian Council in a form different from the version kept in the pontifical archives had to be explained away in the same manner: they must have been falsified by the astute Greeks or by some other schismatics of the thirteenth or fourteenth century. And yet, this was not the first instance of papal letters being read to the Conciliar Fathers in an altered version; but the alterations were always introduced after consultation with the Legates who, on realising that the position in Constantinople differed from what it was assumed to be in Rome when they were handed their credentials, agreed to some changes only to save the prestige of their Popes in the eyes of the Byzantines. And the curious thing, which has so far escaped the historians' notice, was that in the Photian case those passages that voiced the papal claims in the Roman sense were left almost untouched by Photius.

There is another problem in connection with the relations between the Eastern and the Western Churches which claims special consideration. We are wont to date the so-called Eastern Schism from the year 1054, when the envoys of Leo IX excommunicated the Patriarch of Constantinople, Michael Cerularius, but it appears from the latest researches that there are many things remaining to be said about the nature of this rupture and the legitimacy of the legates' action. It is not at all sure how far they were authorised by the Pope to go and the Pope was dead the moment Humbertus placed the bull of excommunication on the High Altar of St. Sophia, all of which makes the legitimacy of the patriarch's excommunication questionable and the beginning of the schism between East and West very uncertain.

One thing is sure: in spite of what happened in 1054, the faithful of both Churches remained long unaware of any change in their relations and acts of intercommunion were so numerous that 1054, as the date of the schism, becomes inadmissible. Some instances of such intercommunion are known, but others

have not yet been published. Special attention should also be paid to the part which Russia of Kiev played in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, after the conversion of Vladimir at the end of the tenth, in the relations between East and West.¹

These and other circumstances converge on the Crusades as the first starting point of the schism, or more correctly, of the estrangement that arose between East and West, and grew into mutual hostility, as the Crusades, from being pious expeditions to liberate the Holy Land and help the Eastern Christians, degenerated into colonising raids on the Near East by the adventurous elements of the West. The part played by the Normans when they occupied Sicily and Southern Byzantine Italy should also be noted.

IV.

Now the Photian case is instructive in more ways than one and yields several lessons. We have seen that those Church historians who followed the wrong trail in the Photian case, far from being prompted by any evil intentions, were inspired by the excellent idea of finding out the best means to defend the papal primacy in the Church. How then did they overlook the features in the Photian case that endorsed the primacy? As I have pointed out elsewhere, Photius never questioned the primacy of the Roman See in matters of faith and the Filioque incident affords no evidence for either his heretical teaching or for his refusal to accept any dogmatic definition confirmed by the Holy See. We know what the position was. Byzantine objections mainly concerned the insertion of the Filioque into the Nicene profession of faith and as this insertion had not yet been authorised in Rome, the Popes agreed with the Byzantines. With regard to the definition of the Filioque, there had been no official condemnation of the contradictory tenet, officially published and confirmed by the Holy See, at any rate, not at that time. We should not be more fastidious in Photius' case than we are in that of St. Thomas, who likewise

¹ Cf. B. Leib, *Rome, Kiev et Byzance à la fin du XI^e siècle* Paris, 1924; M. Jugie, *Schisme Byzantin*, *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, Vol. XIV, 1939, col. 1343 sq. The latter study, though it takes into account many of the new findings, will need altering and completing on many points. We are dealing with Russia of Kiev and its relations with Central Europe and the West in our book, *The Making of Central Europe*, which is at present on its way to the United States for publication.

saw difficulties in admitting the Immaculate Conception, though it is an article of faith to-day. In this particular respect I do not think we can cast stones at Photius.

As regards the primacy in matters of discipline, Photius never denied it : on the contrary, for we find in the Acts of the Photian Synod held in 861 in Constantinople for the special purpose of re-examining the case of Ignatius in the presence of the legates, a declaration, which can be taken as the opinion of the Byzantine Church in Photius' time, to the effect that it accepted the principle of appeal to the See of Rome, even in disciplinary matters, from the judgment of the Patriarch. This was an important statement and one may ask with some show of reason : What more do you want ?

Now the fact that the Church historians of past centuries so persistently overlooked this incident and felt so prone to see in Photius the arch-opponent of the primacy would seem to indicate that they had a different conception of the primacy from that of the easterners in the ninth century. Which leads us to another consideration of primary import for Christian Reunion. We have so far, in the study of the primacy problem, concentrated on its theological aspect to the neglect of its historical angle ; and naturally so, as there are reasons why the Roman Catholic Church laid such stress on this side of the problem. In the general evolution of the Western Church, Roman Catholics considered it imperative to group round a leader and to insist on the principle of the universality of the Church and the necessity of a supreme head for the specific purpose of stemming the disintegration of Western Christendom into small bodies, mutually jealous of each other and powerless to break the tide of materialism and atheism that was sweeping over the Western countries and the New World. Now that it becomes more evident that this same principle, natural as it was to Christians who saw their best weapon in rigid unity, has grown to be the worst obstacle to reunion, it would seem advisable for Church historians to concentrate on the evolutionary aspect of the primacy.

This is not the place to detail the methods likely to yield the best results, not only for want of space, but because this is slippery ground, most treacherous to the unwary. Be it enough to offer a few suggestions.

Thanks to recent research in the history of primitive Christianity, Church historians now generally agree that from the very first centuries the See of Rome enjoyed at least a certain

degree of general esteem and authority ; that its advice in matters of faith used to be taken at least as a lead to a right solution of any disputed issue of Catholic doctrine. All this is clearly explained in a recent book by Rev. T. T. Jalland, *The Church and the Papacy* (Bampton Lectures, Oxford, 1944). Any English reader will find there, summarised and examined the results of the latest finding that will help towards a solution of this problem. Even if some answers cannot yet be taken as final, the summary makes it clear that we have made definite progress since the discussions of the nineteenth century. Research is made in a more conciliatory spirit and many obstacles that obscured a Catholic interpretation have been satisfactorily removed. The distance between our respective tracks has been narrowed down to proximity.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said about the Roman claims in disciplinary matters. There still exist in the Christian theological and historical world considerable differences of opinion as to how far Christians were ready at various periods of the Church's evolution to accept the Pope's direct jurisdiction, how they reacted to the way it was exercised and as to what was regarded as essential in the matter.

To the solution of this problem, so important for the reunion of all Christians under one Head, the study of Church history can bring its valuable contribution. Only, we shall not go very far in this direction, unless we thoroughly master the history of the development of the respective political ideologies of East and West. We should bear in mind that this progress followed different lines in the various parts of the old Roman Empire, and in this field, many matters must be cleared up before we can hazard any conclusions. We must first find out what was the emperor's rôle in the Christian Church after Constantine ; with what truth we may speak of Caesaropapism in the East and how far the Eastern Church succeeded in defeating the claims of Constantine and his successors to the management of the Church.

In this respect, Western Catholics, Anglicans and Protestants have not yet taken advantage of the progress made during the last decades in the history of the Byzantine Empire and of the East in general. We have so far looked upon Byzantium as an oriental State which in the centuries preceding the Eastern schism had by a general transformation lost most of its Roman inheritance and degenerated into a despotic State under the influence of Persian and Arabic ideologies, under

emperors who practically enslaved everybody, especially the Church, whilst only the papacy was able to save some remnants of the Roman patrimony and to hand them on to the new nations that had settled on the soil of the Roman Empire and received the faith at the hands of the popes.

But this is an entirely wrong and distorted picture of what really happened; the opinions it provoked in the minds of westerners were hopelessly misleading and only landed the West, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, into mischievous prejudices against the Eastern Church that did not help in bringing about mutual understanding. Nor is it true what is said about the Church's subservience to the emperors, for she fought their pretensions from the very beginning, whenever they tried to extend their supreme powers to all ecclesiastical affairs or claimed to be the supreme pontiffs of the Christian religion as they had been the supreme pontiffs of the pagan cults. The phases of this struggle have not yet been fully explored and there is glory and distinction that await young historians in this field. It is even possible that we are not at all justified in talking about Caesaropapism in the East, for it is not yet clear whether the emperors dictated in doctrinal matters and imposed their personal beliefs on their subjects or whether they only acted in the name of the bishops and merely gave their imperial endorsement to the doctrinal decisions of heretical councils. All we know thus far about this problem points to the fact that the Eastern Church only acquiesced in the emperor's rôle as some sort of oecumenical deacons whose duty it was, as in the case of the deacons of the primitive Church, to administer the material department of the Church and see to the execution of the canons voted by the assembly of bishops.¹ It is obvious that when we look at the evolution of the Christian East from this angle, things begin to take a different aspect, and it will be the task of Church history to clear this ground in the best interests of interdenominational serenity.

Moreover, the fact that the Eastern Church elaborated its own system of relations with the State and one that worked quite well from the ninth century till the end of the Byzantine Empire should make us tread gently. Quite different was

¹ I am at present preparing a monograph on the relations between Church and State in Eastern Christianity and I hope to deal with this issue more thoroughly.

the evolution in the West, so much so that East and West soon ceased to understand each other. It is simply not true that only Rome succeeded in preserving the essential features of early Christianity: the real continuity of the Roman Empire and of Christianity as it took shape in the first centuries within the frame of Hellenistic culture was to be found in the East and in Byzantium. It was the Western Church that underwent transformations, when the Roman institutions which the Popes and their missionaries set up amongst the newly converted nations were to a certain extent germanised. This Germanization was especially noticeable in the notions of churches and church property and the laity's claim to church administration, both based on the Germanic ideas of property and the functions of the king.

The Roman and Hellenistic spirit on which Western Church organisation had been built reacted from this transformation with such vigour that the papacy and the secular powers fell out on the issue and entered upon a conflict whose designation—the Investiture Contest—is at best very inadequate. Now, it is in this reaction that the key to a solution lies, and in the radical, almost revolutionary, remedy which the reformists of the eleventh century advocated when they claimed the predominance of the spiritual over the temporal in every respect and launched their theory of the two swords which the Popes received from Heaven, the spiritual sword used directly, and the secular sword handled indirectly through the emperor. When such a principle was laid down and widely accepted, it was only to be expected that the prestige of the papacy should grow apace.

It will be the task of the Church historians to re-examine this process and to find out to what extent the reformists' radicalism influenced the growth of the Popes' direct interference in all Church matters. Not until then shall we be in a position to understand the violent revolution that broke out against its application in the sixteenth century and see where we should make a stand, and where we should go back to the spirit of early Christianity.

Nor should we forget—and this needs stressing for the benefit of Protestants and Orthodox—that every principle had its own growth and was dearly valued and defined only after centuries of evolution. This is applicable to the principle of supreme leadership in the Church as well. And the Roman Church developed this principle better than did the Eastern

Church, not only because ever since apostolic times the successor of St. Peter in Rome was held in special veneration by all the Churches and acknowledged as the Head of the whole Church, but also as a result of special political and ideological developments, different from those in the East, which made the stressing of a central authority as easy as it was necessary. To the Eastern Church fell the task of substantially helping to define the revealed truths bearing on the Blessed Trinity and to build up the dogmatic system of Christology. The Western Church, always more interested in practical matters and benefiting by the Roman genius for organisation and administration, concentrated on another field of Christian thought and considered it its special mission to develop the principle of universality, of supreme and central leadership. Events in the nineteenth century only accelerated this evolution, with the definition of the Vatican Council in 1870 as its final stage. This natural growth should be taken into consideration by such Churches and bodies as did not go through the same process and refuse to accept the definition.

In many ways, though not in all, the Christian world finds itself in a position similar to that which characterised the Trinitarian and Christological struggles, when a general council proclaimed a doctrine and all the Churches were invited to accept the decision. This acceptance was rarely achieved without a good deal of preliminary explanations and much display of firmness on the part of the Church that had done most for the final definition of a revealed doctrine. The Seventh Oecumenical Council is a case in point, since it was finally listed among the oecumenical councils by the Western Church only decades after its convocation. This does not apply mathematically to the Vatican Council, but the fact should be noted. It will be the Church historian's business to spotlight the historical background and facilitate the theologians' explanatory work on the definition.

None will deny that heresies may result not only from the denial or the excessive restriction of the meaning of a definition, but also from too wide a connotation. Church history supplies many instances of the kind and the same principle must be applied to the Vatican definition. At the time of the definition there were some radical "ultramontane" opinions and suggestions, as for instance, utterances by L. Veuillot in the *Univers* and others in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, which some theo-

logians tried to set on a theological basis.¹ They found no official support, but the tendency of piling extraneous matters on the vague formula—"the spirit of the Vatican Council" still exists and may, if pushed to extremes, prove as dangerous as the opposite excess.

One thing should be stressed: that the explanation of the definition given by Bishop Fessler, General Secretary of the Council, and especially that given by the Swiss bishops in their common pastoral in 1871,² which was approved by Pius IX, comes very near the Orthodox belief in the infallibility of the Church. The new Canon Law also seems to incline towards this strict interpretation.³

Such are the few suggestions I wanted to make in the hope that they may be useful to anyone interested in Reunion. They are far from being exhaustive; but if Church historians would at least clear the ground we have outlined and this in the near future, the day will not be far when the road to a better understanding between the different Churches and Christian bodies and finally to Christian Reunion will look far easier than it does to-day.

PROFESSOR F. DVORNIK, D.D.

¹ Some interesting accounts on this subject can be found in Dom C. Butler's easily accessible book, *The Vatican Council*, London 1930, I, pp. 72-78. In England, the protagonist of the group of Ultramontanes was W. G. Ward, editor of the *Dublin Review*.

² See the quotation in Dom C. Butler's book, Vol. II, pp. 216-219. The Swiss bishops limit the Pope's infallible pronouncements as follows: "He is tied up and limited to the divine revelation and to the truths which that revelation contains; he is tied up and limited by the Creeds already in existence and by the preceding definitions of the Church; lastly he is tied up and limited by that doctrine divinely revealed which affirms that alongside religious society there is a lay society. . ."

³ *De Magisterio Ecclesiastico*, especially canon 1323: "All those things are to be believed by divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the word of God, written or handed down by tradition, and are proposed by the Church, either by solemn judgment or by her ordinary and universal magisterium, to be believed as having been divinely revealed. Such solemn judgment is pronounced either by an oecumenical Council or by the Roman Pontiff speaking *ex cathedra*."

NEWS AND COMMENTS

The outstanding news in the Orthodox world is that of the enthronement on February 4th of Alexei as the new patriarch of Moscow. This, unlike that of his predecessor, was done with all the traditional pomp which belongs to the occasion.

The suffrages of the members at the National Assembly of the Russian Orthodox Church were given openly and were unanimous. This consisted of some 41 bishops and 126 representatives of the parish clergy. The notable guests from the other Orthodox Churches which attended it were: the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch were there in person; the patriarch of Constantinople was represented by the Metropolitan Germanos of Thyatira, and that of Jerusalem by Archbishop Athenagoras. The Catholicos of Georgia was present. The Metropolitan of Skoplye led a delegation from the Church of Yugoslavia (they were not sent by the Patriarch Gavriilo who is understood to be in Germany), also Rumania was represented by Joseph Bûsoph of Orkoi, and Metropolitan Benjamin who represented some of the Russians in the U.S.A. The Soviet government was officially represented by M. Karpov, chairman of the Council for the Affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church under the Council of People's Commissars of the U.S.S.R.

The new patriarch was born in Moscow on October 27, 1877. He was educated at the university of Moscow where he read Law and graduated in 1899. He then entered the Theological Academy in the same town, then took the habit of a monk and was ordained priest in 1903. After spending some time in directing various seminaries, he became bishop of Tikhvin in 1913. In 1932 he was Metropolitan of Novgorod, but in 1933 he was translated to Leningrad and he was closely associated with its gallant defence. He was nominated on May 15th, 1944, locum tenens of the Throne of Moscow by the late patriarch.¹

We learn from *America* (January 20th) that the new Catholic Ukrainian archbishop of Lvov, the Metropolitan Josef Slipyj, had an interview with M. Ivan Polyansky, chairman of the Soviet government's Council for the Affairs of Religious Cults, to discuss, among other matters, the question of com-

¹ For the above, vid., *The Eastern Churches Broadsheet*, February 1945, *The Tablet*, February 17th and 24th, 1945, also *Orthodox Church Bulletin*, February and March 1945, *S.B.*, March 1945.

munication with Rome. M. Polyansky replied to this: "I told the delegation that there is no objection to Catholics writing to the Pope if they so wished. I understand that the delegation later conveyed my views to the Pope in a registered letter."

Catholic seminaries seem to be functioning in Vilna and Kaunas and the Catholic archbishop of Latvia, Mgr. Anton Springovich, has asked and expects to be able to open another seminary in Riga.

From Hungary there are reports of excellent relations with Church on the part of the Soviet authorities; but that in Yugoslavia, both from the Red Army and that of Tito's army in Belgrade, a full-scale assault against the Church seems to be in preparation.

In Poland under the Lublin provisional government the position of the Church is obscure.¹ The Soviet policy in regard to religion in Poland (as Miss Barbara Ward points out in "Religion in Russia," a thoughtful article in *The Sword of the Spirit*, March 1945), will for us be the test.

The *Osservatore Romano* (February 13th) showed how wrongly informed *Pravda* is about what the Pope said in his Christmas broadcast, and went on: "It looks as though the criticism of Vatican policy made recently by the Council of the Russian Church, meeting at Moscow, has drawn its inspiration from the same source. The Pope is the universal father who said, on June 12th, 1939: 'We have before our eyes the Russia of yesterday, of to-day and of to-morrow; that Russia for which we never cease to pray and ask prayers and in which we fervently believe.' The Vatican is always in favour of that which is good and it is against nobody." (*The Tablet*, February 24th, 1945).

It is reported from New York (C.I.P.): "On the first day of Rome's liberation, and perhaps for the first time in history, Russian Christians led by an Orthodox priest, wearing the red band with the letters U.R.S.S., knelt to receive the papal benediction." (*The Tablet*, March 3rd, 1945).

The Orthodox schism between the Bulgarian Church and Constantinople has now been brought to an end. The Bulgarian Exarch Stefan has been reconciled with the Œcumenical Patriarch. This helps to make for solidarity in the Orthodox world.

¹ See *The Tablet*, March 17th, 1945, "Russia and the Church in Eastern Europe."

The two bishops of the Orthodox Church of Poland at present in England, Bishop Sava of Grodno and Bishop Mateusz of Vilna, have declared that they remain faithful to the Polish State and "condemn the imposed activities of alien elements in Poland, supported by foreign powers." (*The Tablet*, March 3rd).

U.S.A.

In 1924 the Catholics of the Byzantine rite in Rumania like their Orthodox fellows there, adopted the Gregorian Kalendar for the observance of feasts on fixed days only. Those of them in the United States have now extended its use to Easter, and feasts depending on the date thereof as well.

CONCERNING THE ARMENIANS.

The Vartopet Tiran Nersoyan has left London for the United States as locum tenens of the bishopric there. We congratulate him. He has always taken an interest in this review and wrote for us in the last issue.

His place in London has been taken by the Vartopet Shenorhk Kaloustan. He comes from St. James at Jerusalem and was until recently dean of the Theological Seminary at Antilas (Beirut).

The Soviet government have granted permission for the Armenian Church to elect their Catholicos at their ancient see of Echmiadzin.

The new Armenian patriarch of Jerusalem belonged to the Armenian community of Persia and India. He says that this community in India dates from the seventeenth century. (For above vid., E.C.B., February, 1945).

OBITUARY

It is with the greatest regret that we record the death of Mgr. Marius Besson, bishop of Fribourg, Lausanne and Geneva, who died of heart failure on February 24th, 1945. Among his other activities Christian Unity had been the leading preoccupation of his long episcopal career. We had occasion to draw attention to this side of his work in the *E.C.Q.* for October, 1940 (p. 179). May he rest in peace.

TENDENCIES IN THE ORTHODOX CHURCH.

An excellent series of four articles have appeared in *The Tablet* (for February 10th, 17th, 24th and March 3rd), the first two articles bearing on the above title and the last two, that of "The Third Rome and the First." In treating of the Orthodox Church there is always a danger of thinking in terms of the part, e.g., Russia, Greece, etc., instead of the whole, and most newspaper writers succumb to this, especially equating the Orthodox Church with that of the Russian Church. *The Tablet* correspondent has avoided this pitfall; he does consider the whole; he gives the picture on a large canvas.

The articles are written with a view to the prospect of reunion. The key to the theme of these articles may be given from the following quotation:—"Ever since 1054,¹ the year of the Great Schism, there has been read at every service of the Orthodox Church a prayer 'for the reunion of all,' and the fulfilment of the words 'ut omnes unum sint.' It is the expression not only of the abstract desire for reunion as such, for its own sake, but also of the conviction, which has increased ever since the eleventh century, that without reunion the Orthodox Church will in time become incapable of resisting the pressure of secular authorities and will become an instrument in the hand of these; a premonition which, according to Vladimir Soloviev, had already in the nineteenth century proved all too well-founded with regard to the Russian Orthodox Church." (vid., February 10th, p. 64). The writer then goes on to base the reunions of Lyons in 1274 and Florence in 1439 on this principle, viz., "Since the Orthodox Church at an early date virtually lost the very notion of acting independently of the temporal power, it was necessary from the beginning that the latter should show itself politically in favour of reunion before the Church could take any active steps in the matter" (ibid.). We would query some of this. Some historians² date the Schism from the failure of the Emperor Manuel (1143-1180) to regain his possessions in the

¹ This statement needs mitigation: (i) The prayer is not read at *every* service; (ii) It does not speak of re-union but of union; (iii) It existed in the Litany long before the schism and referred to the commonplace quarrels of local churches, etc.

² See the interesting article, "East and West in the Twelfth Century," by George Every in *Sobornost*, December, 1944.

West and so to restore relations between the five Patriarchates. But there can certainly be no clear cut date, such as 1054, given for the separation of East and West.

What also of the different conceptions of the relation of Church to State in East and West since the time of St. Augustine?¹ The Church of Byzantium remained essentially Roman in its outlook on the State. The Christian emperor, the representative of the people, is God-beloved, sacred—the Christian State is part of the process of the transfiguration of the whole creation. Even in the West the Ambrosian-Gelasian tradition is more respectful to the State than Augustine.

“After 1453,” our writer continues, “when the Byzantine Empire had ceased to exist, the primacy in the Orthodox Church passed to the Church of Moscow, and at Moscow from the very start there was a strong conviction on the part of the Government of the necessity for the complete independence of its Church from any other power” (ibid.). Surely there should be a distinction made between the attitude of Church and State in Russia before and after Peter the Great, also the period when Kiev was the centre of Christian Russia should have been noted.

So much for the historical background. Both the Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church are now dealing with a new world, especially is this true of Orthodox Russia. The year 1917 will indeed be a landmark. The Revolution then had a two-fold effect. To quote again: “First the Russian Church was freed from the tutelage of the State, whatever happened to it, so that at least, exiled and persecuted, it was able to act independently in so far as it could act at all. Secondly, it gave the greatest stimulus to the conviction on the part of the Russian Church that it was, or had become, incapable of existing independently, and needed a support, in the shape if not of a State then of another religious body. After five centuries, therefore, the ground was, on the Orthodox side, again favourable to the idea of reunion” (ibid.). This then, is how our writer sees the position. From this, as a basis, he goes on in the remaining articles to review the present position of all the Orthodox Churches and also the views of Pius XI and the present Holy Father to this state of things as set forth in their writings and in their policy towards Catholics of the Oriental rites.

¹ See the article of Professor Armstrong, “St. Augustine and the Eastern Tradition,” in the *E.C.Q.*, October-December, 1944, especially pp. 398-399.

As regards the Orthodox Church, he takes the attitude that the co-operation of the Orthodox with the Œcumenical Movement was a sign of their seeking a much needed external support and an alternative to reunion with Rome, and he further asserts that "Pope Pius XI's encyclical *Mortalium animos* saved the Orthodox Church from falling victim to the attempts of the Protestants¹ to induce it to join in forming a strong non-Catholic Christian *bloc* as a counterweight to the Catholic Church in the modern world." (February 17th, p. 77). This statement, unless the writer can produce positive proof, seems to us wishful thinking, since we have the opinions of two such leading Orthodox as Father Sergius Bulgakov and Professor H. Alivisatos of Athens speaking on the said encyclical unfavourably in no uncertain language.²

We doubt whether *The Tablet* correspondent has really understood the Orthodox attitude to such gatherings as the conference on "Faith and Order." This may well be stated in the words of Professor Alivisatos: "Orthodox theologians try to piece the actual distance which now separates the several Churches, as well as to fix the maximum elasticity of their own Church, an elasticity which could not extend beyond permitted limits the moment that the doctrine of the real catholic and undivided Church comes into question." Also in the assertion of the Orthodox present at Lausanne in 1927, that "where the totality of the Faith is absent, there can be no *communio in sacris*."³ It was here that the Orthodox Delegation presented their famous Declaration, stating the mind of their Church on Christian unity. It should also be noted that Pius XI did not publish *Mortalium animos* till 1928.

Our writer then deals with the plans and preparation for the holding of an Orthodox Œcumenical Council, 1933-34, giving some interesting side lights as to why it failed to be held. He also speaks of the first Congress of Orthodox Theologians held in Athens in 1936. Both these events precede the Second World Conference on Faith and Order at Edinburgh in 1937 to which the Orthodox sent a repre-

¹ It must be said here that the writer is thinking of continental Protestants; he places the Church of England apart. See February 10th.

² Vid., *The Christian East*, Autumn 1928, pp. 116-130, where two protests from the above are printed.

³ For full discussion see *The Orthodox and Edinburgh* 1937, in the *E.C.Q.* of January, 1938. Has the writer read the Encyclical of the Patriarch of Constantinople of January, 1920, *To all the Churches of Christ, wherever they may be*?

sentation and these again presented a Declaration defining their position and commenting on the various Reports of the Congress, again proclaiming to all the Orthodox Faith. It was at the Conference on "Life and Work" held at Oxford that the question of the relations between the individual and the modern State was discussed and the social encyclicals of the Popes made use of. The correspondent then deals with various groupings of the Russian Orthodox outside the U.S.S.R., which resulted after the death of Patriarch Tikhon, arguing (we think wrongly) that the "Eulogians" are seeking to bring Orthodoxy closer to the Protestant communions while the Karlovatz group tend towards Catholicism.

From this he passes on to the present scene, the reaction on the part of the *émigré* Russian Church to the Moscow patriarch and also that of other Orthodox Churches, e.g., Yugoslavia, Greece; then to the further picture of the subservience of the new Patriarch Alexei to the anti-papal propaganda of Moscow. How far is this due to the memory of the past tradition dating from Peter the Great, or, as the writer indicates, to the instinctive anti-Catholic policy of the Russian Orthodox clergy, or even only as his part of the forced price to be paid for the restoration of the Russian Church? And then what of the agreement of the Œcumenical Patriarch and others who were represented at the election in Moscow in this policy? Certainly the views expressed in the five documents¹ emanating from the "General Council" in Moscow are important and should be noted, as also the reactions of other Orthodox to this policy. And here we think the writer is correct in considering that these reactionary groups will tend towards friendship with Rome, and so this may lead to some ultimate reunion. The writer is thinking not only of Russians but also of Greeks and Serbs, etc. (March 3rd, p. 101).

Before we give our conclusion we would point out some of the most important of the factual mistakes that the writer has fallen into. First, it is wrong to say (February 10th, p. 65) that the Theological Congress in Athens was from the start

¹ The five documents are :—(1) A message from the Russian Orthodox Church to the Soviet Government. (2) A message from the Russian Orthodox Church to the faithful of Russia. (3) A message of the Russian Orthodox Church to Christians throughout the world. (4) A message from the representatives of the other Orthodox Churches to Christians throughout the world. (5) A speech of G. K. Karpov, the Soviet Government's representative at the Council. (*The Tablet*, February 17th, 1945).

influenced by the "Eulogian" faction. What should be noted was a strong reaction against Father Bulgakov's ideas on the part of the Greek theologians and one of the Paris theologians, Father Florovsky, took the side of the Greeks.

It was incorrect to state that either Popes Pius X or Pius XI themselves offered the Mass according to the Eastern rite (February 17th, p. 77). In the case of Pius X the Byzantine Liturgy was celebrated by the Melkite Patriarch, Cyril VIII, in the presence of the Pope. In the case of Pius XI, in 1925 the Holy Father celebrated himself a Roman Mass for the sixteenth centenary of the Council of Nicea. As to the Creed being sung in Greek at a papal Mass, this sometimes, and the Gospel always, have been done since the Middle Ages.

Concerning what the writer says in regard to the "Theological Academy" in Paris receiving much practical help from the Church of England and the Y.M.C.A. (February 24th, p. 89), first there is no "Theological Academy" in Paris. There is an Academy of religious philosophy, a society of laymen which gives open lectures without any definite curriculum, without students (but only "hearers") and without conferring degrees. This has never had any "practical help" from either the Church of England or the Y.M.C.A. There is also a Russian Institute of Orthodox Theology (which prepares students for the priesthood). This has had financial help from the Church of England but not from the Y.M.C.A. This last has only helped the Russian branch of the Christian Students' Movement. If by the reference to Nicholas Berdyaev lecturing in Paris the writer means at the Theological Institute (March 3rd, p. 101), it is untrue. Berdyaev has never taught in the Institute.

Concerning the reference to the clergy of the Metropolitan Eulogius seceding to Metropolitan Eleutherius (February 24th, pp. 89, 90), out of about eighty priests of the Paris diocese only five or six seceded. And at a synod composed of the clergy and laity all the parishes decided in favour of the Metropolitan Eulogius. It should also be stated that the Metropolitan Eulogius has never pronounced any interdict or encouraged any controversy against the Metropolitan Anthony. The interdicts have all come from the side of the Karlovtsi Synod.

It should also be noted that the diocese of Paris is only temporarily under the jurisdiction of the Œcumenical Patriarch (by the application of Canon 28 of the Council of Chalcedon according to the ruling of the Orthodox Church), and both

priests and people are carrying on quite peacefully; there is no idea of a dilemma (vid., March 3rd, p. 101).

Nevertheless these articles are of great interest and give us much valuable information; yet we cannot help feeling that the problem throughout is considered too much in terms of *ecclesiastical politics*. To rely on and to build one's hopes of reunion on these have more often than not led to failure in the past. This taking advantage of the course of world politics as a principle for bringing about Christian unity, is at best but a negative approach to the problem. We are inclined to think that though such things cannot be ignored by them, recent Popes (and our writer himself gives various references that indicate this), are for working on much more positive lines. "To unite," said Pius XI, "we must above all know one another." Surely in viewing this crisis which the Orthodox Churches are being called upon to face, other influences than ecclesiastical politics must be considered. The history of Constantinople in the past and recent past, the history of the Russian Church under the Tartars, the whole of the Middle East under Moslem yoke have shown examples of subservient Church leaders and also examples of saints, some of whom protested and challenged the State, but some made their protest in a passive way, the way of the "humiliated Christ." There were doubtless politics on the part of some but there was a very large mixture of an other-worldly and ascetic approach to the whole question of what attitude the Church (and Churchmen) should take to the State. This does not, of course, excuse the open attack of the Patriarch Alexei on the Vatican, but this background added to inbred prejudice may help to explain it.

Also another fact should be taken into consideration if we are looking to ultimate reunion. If this policy on the part of Orthodox leaders in the U.S.S.R. and elsewhere is going to make it possible for the widespread public celebration of the Holy Mysteries and the supernatural building up of a Christian people in the midst of this vast post-war new materialistic world, the ground is being prepared for the work of the Spirit. After all, "it is by the Mass" (if we may be allowed to quote from another page of this present issue), "that they (our separated brethren) are actually being drawn into closer unity with us and that from the centre of the Mass there are going out to them great pulses of saving grace, then we see the really central place that the liturgy and indeed

all prayer must have in all efforts to restore Christian unity." (See Father Crichton's article). This is indeed true wherever the Holy Sacrifice is offered and Christ is given as the food of man. And from such Food are saints fashioned.

An Orthodox priest wrote me that much more attention should be given to our different lines of development since the Schism. On the Catholic side, the Councils of Trent and the Vatican, and on the Orthodox side the outcome of Hesychasm, e.g., the prevalence of the mystical, charismatic and pneumatic elements to be placed over the hierarchy and institutions. In the adjustment of these, and not in the Infallibility of the Pope, he says, is the crux of the problem.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

To the Editor, *E.C.Q.*

DEAR SIR,

I feel that the review of Dr. Lampert's book, *The Divine Realm*, is not adequate. The first condition of all reunion must be *truth* and Dr. Lampert goes far beyond minor questions of theological expression or of criticisms of St. Thomas. Your reviewer points out that "there are many things in it (the book) which a Catholic cannot accept" but does not indicate how serious these things are. Dr. Lampert seems to hold a monism quite incompatible with Catholic teaching and apparently as a consequence, holds that the world is *necessary* to God. Minor matters of Thomism or Augustinianism are irrelevant in the face of such divergences. Further, no sane Thomist will resent the most trenchant criticism of Thomism, but he will regret misunderstanding of it. Dr. Lampert seems to me (who have no expert knowledge) to give a quite incorrect picture of St. Thomas on causality and God.

If these things are so, they ought not to have been glossed over. Much more good will come of facing these facts and thrashing out the difficulties.

The thing has a wider importance. If Dr. Lampert's views are at all representative of modern Orthodoxy, then problems of reunion are going to be a little more difficult than we thought them to be.

All this is not to say that there are not valuable things

in the book and we must be grateful to the author for stating his views frankly, but readers of *E.C.Q.* hardly had a fair chance of learning what they were.

Yours, etc.,
J.D.C.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

The Prayers for Ordinary Days of the Week According to the Rite of the Holy Church of Antioch of the Syrians. (Patriarchal Press, Sharfeh, 1937.) (In Syriac).

There have been in all three Jacobite and five Catholic printed editions of the Shehimo or book of the West Syrian Ferial Office. The Jacobite editions are: that printed in 1890 at Deir-Za'faran (the monastery near Mardin in Turkey which was then the residence of the Jacobite patriarch); the edition published by Bishop (now Patriarch) Bartaum in 1913; and a new edition published in 1936 by the present patriarch and printed at St. Mark's Monastery, Jerusalem.

The Catholic editions are: those printed in 1696, 1787 and 1853 in Rome; and those published at Sharfeh in 1902 (by the late patriarch, Mar Ignatios Ephrem Rahmani) and 1937.

The 1937 edition (which appeared in 1939) has a preface by the present patriarch, His Eminence Cardinal Tappouni. There follow the fixed prayers for the different canonical hours, and a series of Sedhro's preceded by their Prumiya's: of the Mother of God, of the Cross, of the Saints, the common Sedhro, of departed priests, of all the faithful departed, of penitence. Then come sext and none for Sunday, and vespers, compline, nocturns, matins, terce, sext and none for week days from Monday to Saturday. After none of Saturday occur compline of Sunday¹ and the service for departed priests which is sung immediately afterwards. Then comes the special compline which is sung in Lent on all days of the

¹ Vespers, nocturns, matins and terce of Sundays, greater feasts and Lent are contained in the Penqitho. In the Eastern rites, vespers and compline are always of the following day (there are no "second vespers"). Thus, vespers and compline of Sunday are sung on Saturday evening, vespers and compline of Monday are sung on Sunday evening, and so on. We may note, however, the following passage from the West Syrian Monday vespers which is as it were a leave-taking of Sunday: "On this first day of the week which passeth away Thou has given us to eat Thy Body and Thy Blood, O Son of God; on that first day of the week which passeth not away make us all worthy to sing at Thy right hand, halleluia, and to see Thy mercy."

week except Saturday, Sunday and feasts of the first degree which occur during that season.

There follow the Mawrbhe (antiphons to the Magnificat, corresponding to the Μεγαλυνάρια of the Byzantine rite) for the eight tones, which are sung at nocturns on week-days (there are special Mawrbhe or Μεγαλυνάρια for matins on Sundays and feasts, which are contained in the Penqitho).

The Mawrbhe are followed by the prayers to be said before the fixed psalms at vespers on Sundays, feasts of the Lord and during Lent, and by the fixed psalms and biblical canticles preceded by their respective prayers, to be said at matins on Sunday. Then follow the seven "Praises" to be recited at the beginning of the "Greek canons" at matins on Sunday. These "Praises" correspond to the nine biblical odes at ὄρθρος in the Byzantine office and to the canticles from the Old Testament at lauds in the Roman and monastic breviaries.

Next occur the "Teshmeshto's" or services of the Mother of God and of the saints, one of which is sung at nocturns after the psalms 148, 149, 150 and 116, in honour of the saint or saints of the day indicated in the kalendar. On days on which no particular saint is commemorated, a teshmeshto is sung in honour of the patron saint of the church in which the divine office is being celebrated. The teshmeshto's are as follows: (1) of the Mother of God; (2) of the angels; (3) of an apostle; (4) of several apostles or of the 72 disciples feast on July 5th); (5) of a martyr; (6) of several martyrs; (7) of a doctor or a bishop; (8) of a confessor, solitary, monk or ascetic, and of other saints; (9) of a woman martyr; (10) of a woman saint or other than a martyr.

The teshmeshto's of the saints are followed by those of the Victorious Cross, which is sung when the Holy Cross is venerated, and especially on Fridays in Lent and on Wednesday of mid-Lent, and by the teshmeshto for the dead.

An appendix contains vespers, nocturns, matins and terce of Sunday for private recitation only¹, the Kalendar (in which St. Benedict has been added as a memorial of the third degree

¹ Among the Jacobites the office is obligatory only in choir; but clerics and monks who have not been present in choir must say a "station," that is to say, the Trisagion and the Lord's Prayer, in the place of each canonical hour. As regards the Catholic Syrians, the Synod of Sharfeh (1888) lays down the following rules concerning the divine office: (1) In all churches where there are two or more priests, the whole canonical office must be accomplished in choir every day. (This is little observed nowadays in many places, except as regards none, vespers and compline

on March 21st) and a table of movable feasts from the year 1940 to the year 2000.

The only criticism we venture to make of this new Catholic edition of the West Syrian ferial office is the lack of good taste shown in the choice of the pictures which appear on some of the pages. In all other respects it is excellent, and, together with the Penqitho printed by the Dominican Fathers at Mossul in 1886, is the most artistic of the Syro-Antiochene liturgical books so far produced. The text is printed in black and red in the "serto" character, and is sufficiently vocalized (with the Greek vowels, according to the West Syrian tradition) to enable anyone with a working knowledge of Syriac to read correctly. The fixed prayers at the beginning are printed in smaller characters than the rest of the book; and the "estrangelo" script also is used for some of the titles, headings and rubrics.

A new edition of other Syro-Antiochene liturgical books, such as the anaphora-book and the pontifical, is being prepared.

DOM BENEDICT MORRISON.

Other book reviews will be brought out in a supplement during the course of this year.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Sheed & Ward: *My Sunday Missal*.

Oxford University Press: *The Study of St. Athanasius*. F. L. Cross.

A Short Life of Kierkegaard. Walter Lowrie.

The Word Press, Hadzor: *A Missionary in the War Net*. H. Van Straelen.

on Saturday evening and on the eves of feasts). (2) The deacon, priest and clerics of superior rank who leave choir at the end of matins in order to enter the sanctuary for the preliminaries of the Eucharistic Liturgy, are not bound to recite privately terce and sext (which are being sung in choir while they are in the sanctuary or the sacristy), but it suffices that they say a "station" for each of these hours. (3) A deacon, priest or cleric of superior rank, who was not present at the canonical office from the beginning, must continue the office with the choir till the end, and afterwards supply privately the parts he missed. (4) Deacons, priests and bishops are bound to the recitation of the office daily, either in choir or privately. (5) Out of choir he who cannot recite the festal office (when it is to be said) through lack of a copy of the Penqitho, must say in lieu thereof the ferial office in the Shehimo.

In the 1902 edition of the Shehimo no. office for Sunday was given (except, of course, for compline, sext and none). That contained in the 1939 edition is the office for Easter Day. A rubric at the beginning says that it may be said only in case of necessity, that is to say, out of choir and when one cannot say it in the Penqitho.

P A X

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW OF THE BENEDICTINES
OF PRINKNASH

CONTENTS OF SPRING NUMBER, 1945

The Abbot's Letter	
The First English Trinitarians	Tudor Edwards
Andrew Szepticky	Donald Attwater
Origins of Monastic Liturgy	Fr. John Morson, O.C.R.
A Nun's First Vows	The Rev. H. E. Rope, M.A.
An Italian Correspondence	Bro. Gregory
A Presbyterian Liturgical Movement	Dom Benedict Steuart, O.S.B.
The Three Encounters	Alice Dease
Gethsemane	D.Th.
Mr. St. Clair Baddeley: A Memory	D.B.S.
Prinknash Notes	
Notices of Books	

Single copy 1/1½ post free. Annual subscription 4/6 post free.

FROM

THE SECRETARY FOR PUBLICATIONS
PRINKNASH ABBEY GLOUCESTER

At your Service

for all printing requirements

CATHOLIC RECORDS PRESS

EXETER



Present List of Books post free

Abandonment to Divine Providence..	13/1	St. Philomena's Roses ..	4/9
Eucharistic Hours ..	3/10	Story of St. Philomena in Pictures ..	6d.
Eucharistic Hour ..	3/10	Life of St. Philomena ..	6d.
Eucharistic Triduum and Apostolate of the Sick ..	3/10	Some Loving Thoughts of Jesus in the Tabernacle ..	9d.
Devout Mass-Server ..	1/8	Novena to St. Benedict ..	6d.
Religion of To-day ..	1/-	Benedictine Hours ..	3/6
Contemplative Prayer Cloth 5/3 Paper 3/3		Easy Way to Use the Psalms ..	5/4
Origin and Development of Roman and Liturgical Vestments ..	2/6	Eucharistic Charts, 12 Charts, 40 x 25, for School Use ..	5/7
La Sainte Union des Sacres Coeurs—Life of the Founder ..	6/6	Eucharistic Notes on the Charts ..	3/10
What Think you of Christ? ..	6d.	School Plays—Brothers, 1 Act ..	1/-
Gregorian Rhythm ..	8d.	School Plays—St. Ambrose, 4 Acts ..	2/6
Lucette ..	9d.	Little Crown of St. Joseph ..	1/6
Book of Early Religious Verse ..	9d.	Concise French Syntax ..	2/6
Come Round the Fire ..	2/-	The White Sunbonnet (Religious Stories of Country Life) ..	2/-
Daily Thoughts for Legionaries of Mary ..	8d.	Rosminian Sisters—Life of First English Superior ..	11/-
Japan's Martyr Church Cloth 4/3 Paper 2/9			